BEST AVAILABLE COPY

REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 7, 14, and 18 have been amended to clarify the subject matter regarded as the invention. Claims 19-69 have been added. Claims 1-69 remain pending.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-12, 14, and 18 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Claims 1-12, 14, and 18 have been amended to clarify the subject matter of those claims.

The Examiner has rejected claims 13-18 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huitema, WO 99/27680.

The rejection is respectfully traversed. With respect to claim 13, Huitema describes querying a local server to obtain the IP address of a remote computer. Huitema does not describe retrieving the IP address from an object oriented database. Using an object oriented database would not have been obvious to one of skill in the art because a DNS server typically uses a relational database for storing DNS data. See page 3, lines 11-17 in the application. In addition, it is not apparent how an object oriented database would be used for storing DNS data such as taught in Figures 6 and 7. For example, Figure 6 illustrates how DNS data would be stored in an object oriented database and Figure 7 illustrates how a network would be reconfigured in the database. These operations have been claimed in new dependent claims 19-23.

Claims 14-21 depend from claim 13 and are believed to be allowable for the same reasons described above.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-12 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Frese, II et al (hereinafter Frese), US 5,909,545 in view of Huitema, WO 99/27680.

The rejection is respectfully traversed. With respect to claim 1, Frese describes remotely controlling an application program over a network. The Examiner states that it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Frese and Huitema because "Frese's teachings of remote controlling and configuring the server can also be implemented to the DNS server system of

PAGE 12/13 * RCVD AT 8/20/2004 2:57:56 PM [Eastern Daylight Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-1/8 * DNIS:8729306 * CSID:4089732595 * DURATION (mm-ss):04-26

Huitema's system by not only access the remote DNS servers but also configure the DNS servers." Huitema teaches accessing a remote DNS server, not configuring a remote DNS server. Prior to the teaching of this application, DNS server software did not permit access to GUIs for remote configuration unless software, such as PC Anywhere, was specially installed on every computer. See page 3, lines 21-28 of the application. Neither Huitema nor Frese suggest providing configuration access to a DNS server by "establishing communicative coupling between a client web browser and a web server of the DNS server system," as recited in amended claim 1. As such, claim 1 is believed to be allowable.

Claims 2-11 depend from claim 1 and are believed to be allowable for the same reasons described above.

Claims 24-46 recite program code for carrying out the methods of claims 1-23 respectively. Therefore, it is believed that claims 24-46 are also allowable.

Claims 47-69 recite systems for carrying out the methods of claims 1-23, respectively. Therefore, it is believed that claims 47-69 are also allowable.

Reconsideration of the application and allowance of all claims are respectfully requested based on the preceding remarks. If at any time the Examiner believes that an interview would be helpful, please contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

Clover Huang

Clover Huang
Registration No. 55,285
V 408-973-2594
F 408-973-2595

VAN PELT AND YI, LLP
10050 N. Foothill Blvd., Suite 200
Cupertino, CA 95014

PAGE 13/13 * RCVD AT 8/20/2004 2:57:56 PM [Eastern Daylight Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-1/8 * DNIS:8729306 * CSID:4089732595 * DURATION (mm-ss):04-26

This Page is Inserted by IFW Indexing and Scanning Operations and is not part of the Official Record

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:

- ☐ BLACK BORDERS
- ☐ IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES
- ☐ FADED TEXT OR DRAWING
- ☐ BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING
- ☐ SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES
- ☐ COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS
- ☐ GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS
- ☑ LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT
- ☐ REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY
- ☐ OTHER: _____

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.
As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IFW Image Problem Mailbox.